

1 **The energetics of fish growth and how it constrains food-web trophic structure**

2 Diego R. Barneche^{1,*}, Andrew P. Allen²

3 ¹Centre for Geometric Biology, School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton Vic 3800, Australia

4 ²Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney NSW 2109, Australia

5 *Present address: School of Life and Environmental Sciences, The University of Sydney, Camperdown NSW
6 2006, Australia

7 **Statement of authorship:** D.R.B. compiled the data, D.R.B. and A.P.A. conceived the study,
8 analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript.

9 **Data accessibility statement:** All data and R code (data manipulation, analyses, figures and
10 tables) can be downloaded from a GitHub repository (<https://github.com/dbarneche/FishGrowth>),
11 which will be made publicly available upon publication.

12 **Running title:** Energetics from individuals to ecosystems

13 **Keywords:** physiology, climate change, fisheries, efficiency, biomass, productivity, trophic
14 pyramids

15 **Type of article:** Letters

16 **Word Count:** 4,910 (main text), 147 (Abstract)

17 **Number of references:** 48

18 **Number of figures:** 4

19 **Number of tables:** 1

20 **Correspondence should be sent to:** Diego R. Barneche, Centre for Geometric Biology /
21 School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Vic. 3800, Australia (Tel: +61
22 (3) 9905 5100; Email: barnechedr@gmail.com).

23 ABSTRACT

24 The allocation of metabolic energy to growth fundamentally influences all levels of biological
25 organization. Here we use a first-principles theoretical model to characterize the energetics
26 of fish growth at distinct ontogenetic stages and in distinct thermal regimes. Empirically,
27 we show that the mass scaling of growth rates follows that of metabolic rate, and is somewhat
28 steeper at earlier ontogenetic stages. We also demonstrate that the cost of growth, E_m ,
29 varies substantially among fishes, and that it may increase with temperature, trophic level, and
30 level of activity. Theoretically, we show that E_m is a primary determinant of the efficiency of
31 energy transfer across trophic levels, and that energy is transferred more efficiently between
32 trophic levels if the prey are young and sedentary. Overall, our study demonstrates the importance
33 of characterizing the energetics of individual growth in order to understand constraints
34 on the structure of food webs and ecosystems.

35 INTRODUCTION

36 Organisms must expend energy to gather, consume, and transform the resources necessary to
37 produce biomass, so the rate of biomass production is fundamental at multiple biological levels
38 (Lindeman 1942). At the individual level, it influences fitness by constraining how quickly
39 an organism reaches maturity and subsequently produces offspring (Brown *et al.* 1993). At
40 the population level, it constrains the intrinsic rate of population increase (Savage *et al.* 2004).
41 At the community level, it constrains how much energy and materials can flow to the next
42 trophic level in a food web (Andersen *et al.* 2009; Irigoien *et al.* 2013). And, at the ecosystem
43 level, the fraction of assimilated energy lost in producing that biomass (through respiration)
44 limits the total heterotrophic metabolism, and hence the number of trophic levels, that can be
45 supported in a food web (Lindeman 1942; Pauly & Christensen 1995).

46 We still lack a comprehensive theoretical understanding of the energetics of growth, despite
47 recent progress (e.g. West *et al.* 2001; Hou *et al.* 2008; Kooijman 2009). Fish are excellent
48 model organisms for evaluating such a theory because they encompass the highest
49 global species richness among vertebrates ($> 33,000$ species), they range in body mass by
50 over > 8 orders of magnitude ($\sim 0.1 \text{ g} - 1 \times 10^7 \text{ g}$), and they occupy diverse freshwater and
51 marine habitats that vary substantially in thermal regime ($\sim 0 - 40^\circ\text{C}$; Froese & Pauly 2017).

52 Understanding the energetics of growth is of immense practical importance. For example, in
53 fisheries management, knowing how long wild fish stocks take to achieve maturity, and how
54 much food they need to do so, is crucial for establishing sustainable yields in fisheries man-
55 agement (Szuwalski *et al.* 2017). Moreover, sustainable yields at ocean-basin scales may in
56 the future be affected by changes in environmental variables such as temperature through their
57 effects on the growth energetics of individual fish (e.g. van Rijn *et al.* 2017). Extensive em-
58 pirical work has documented determinants of fish growth (e.g. Houde 1989); however, these
59 studies have typically focused on how one or few species at a particular life stage respond to
60 a particular set of environmental conditions. With few notable exceptions (see, for example,
61 Pauly & Pullin 1988; Houde 1989; Charnov & Gillooly 2004; Sibly *et al.* 2015), there has
62 been little attempt to generalize determinants of individual-level biomass production across
63 multiple fish species within a theoretical framework.

64 Theoretical work on the mechanisms underlying growth dynamics has focused primarily
65 on understanding why individuals tend to follow a sigmoid growth trajectory over ontogeny
66 such that mass-specific growth rate is rapid during early life stages, but slows down as indi-
67 viduals approach an asymptotic adult size. More than half a century ago, Ludwig von Berta-
68 lanffy (1938) proposed that these sigmoid growth trajectories arise because the overall rate
69 of catabolism increases more rapidly with size than the rate of anabolism. While the mecha-
70 nistic basis of this model (hereafter BGM) has been questioned by many, including fisheries
71 scientists (e.g. Enberg *et al.* 2008), the BGM is frequently employed for fish because it of-
72 ten provides a reasonable statistical fit to ontogenetic growth data. Importantly, however, the
73 BGM is usually fitted using widely-available data on fish length, rather than less-available
74 data on mass, which is unfortunate given that growth is fundamentally an energetic process,
75 and that the energetic costs of growth are related to changes in mass (West *et al.* 2001; Hou *et*
76 *al.* 2008; Moses *et al.* 2008).

77 West *et al.* (2001) proposed an ontogenetic growth model (see also Gillooly *et al.* 2002;
78 Moses *et al.* 2008) that is based on principles of allometry and mass and energy balance. Hou
79 *et al.* (2008) subsequently expanded this model (hereafter OGM) by explicitly partitioning
80 the total metabolic rate into active, growth, and maintenance components. Consequently,
81 the OGM predicts that growth rates are inextricably linked to the size- and temperature-

dependencies of metabolic rate, consistent with empirical data (Pauly & Pullin 1988; Houde 1989; Atkinson 1994; Gillooly *et al.* 2002; Brown *et al.* 2004). Although the OGM can be mathematically similar in functional form to the BGM (Makarieva *et al.* 2004), its conceptual foundations are fundamentally different. In particular, while growth is an anabolic process, maintenance in the OGM involves both anabolism and catabolism because, for example, protein turnover is fueled by respiration.

Of particular relevance, the OGM reveals the importance of a particular parameter, E_m , which is the amount of energy that must be expended in respiration to produce a fixed quantity of biomass (West *et al.* 2001; Hou *et al.* 2008; Moses *et al.* 2008). This quantity has been shown to vary substantially within and among different clades of animals (Wieser 1994; Moses *et al.* 2008; Sears *et al.* 2012). However, to our knowledge, is still unknown to what extent this variation reflects differences in physiology versus environmental and/or ecological factors. Understanding how and why E_m varies is fundamental because, as we will demonstrate later, this quantity constrains food-web structure via its effects on the efficiency of energy transfer between trophic levels.

In this study, we use the OGM as a framework to characterize the mass and temperature dependence of growth rates for marine and freshwater fishes. In so doing, we first quantify the fraction of total metabolic energy allocated to biomass production across different species at differing life stages and temperature regimes. Using these data, we then test three hypotheses: *H1: Growth rates exhibit the same mass scaling exponent as metabolic rate at different ontogenetic stages; H2: E_m is temperature independent; and H3: E_m is independent of ecological variables such as trophic level and level of activity.* Finally, we combine our empirical estimates of E_m with novel theory to explore how it constrains food-web structure through its effects on the efficiency of energy transfer between trophic levels.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Theory and hypotheses

Hypothesis H1

The OGM (West *et al.* 2001; Hou *et al.* 2008) is derived based on energy balance for an or-

ganism with a wet mass of m (in g), a resting metabolic rate of B_r (i.e. J d^{-1}), and a growth rate per unit time, t (d), of dm/dt (g d^{-1}),

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = \frac{B_r}{E_m} \left[1 - \left(\frac{m}{M} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right] = \frac{B_o(T)}{E_m} m^\alpha \left[1 - \left(\frac{m}{M} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right], \quad (1)$$

where $B_r = B_o(T)m^\alpha$, $B_o(T)$ is a metabolic normalization constant independent of body mass ($\text{J g}^{-\alpha} \text{d}^{-1}$) that varies among fish taxa and with absolute body temperature (Barneche *et al.* 2014), $T(\text{K})$, α is a dimensionless mass-scaling exponent that is theoretically predicted to take a value of 3/4 in the fractal-like distribution model of West *et al.* (1997), and E_m is the energy expended to produce one unit of biomass (J g^{-1}). The expression $[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}]$ is the fraction of resting metabolic energy that is allocated to growth. This fraction approaches 0 as the organism approaches its asymptotic adult mass, M , at which point all resting metabolic energy is allocated to maintenance, which is assumed to remain constant on a mass-specific basis over ontogeny.

Hypothesis H1: Growth rates exhibit the same mass scaling exponent as metabolic rate at different ontogenetic stages. The OGM states that the mass scaling of growth rates are governed by the effects of body mass on resting metabolic rates, B_r . Empirically, it has been observed that early in ontogeny, the scaling of metabolic rates in fish can be substantially steeper (Bochdansky & Leggett 2001) than the canonical 3/4 value observed for adult fish (Barneche *et al.* 2014). Whether these shifts in metabolic mass scaling over ontogeny are also observed for growth rates remains poorly explored. However, this phenomenon can be empirically assessed by fitting growth-rate data at different ontogenetic stages to a function of the same form as that commonly fitted to metabolic rates (eqns S1–S3),

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = g_o m^\gamma e^{\frac{E_g}{k} \left(\frac{1}{T_s} - \frac{1}{T} \right)} I(T)^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where g_o is a normalized growth rate that is independent of mass and temperature ($\text{g}^{1-\gamma} \text{d}^{-1}$) at some arbitrary standardized temperature, T_s (K), k is the Boltzmann constant ($8.62 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV K}^{-1}$), γ is a dimensionless mass-scaling exponent, and E_g (eV) is an activation energy (Barneche *et al.* 2014). With respect to size, eqn 1 predicts that

134 $g_o \propto [1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}]$, implying a decline in normalized rates with increasing ontogenetic
 135 stage, m/M . With respect to temperature, $e^{\frac{E_g}{k}(\frac{1}{T_s} - \frac{1}{T})}$ is the Boltzmann relationship that char-
 136 acterizes temperature-induced enhancement of growth rates below the temperature optimum,
 137 T_{opt} (K), using an activation energy, E_g (eV) (Gillooly *et al.* 2002). The inactivation term,
 138 $I(T) = \left(1 + \left(\frac{E_g}{E_i - E_g}\right) e^{\frac{E_i}{k}(\frac{1}{T_{opt}} - \frac{1}{T})}\right)$, characterizes declines in rates at temperature T above
 139 T_{opt} using an inactivation parameter, E_i (Schoolfield *et al.* 1981; Barneche *et al.* 2014).

140 *Hypotheses H2–H3*

141 The respiratory energy expended in producing a unit of biomass, E_m , can be calculated by
 142 rearranging eqn 1:

$$E_m = B_r \frac{dt}{dm} [1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}]. \quad (3)$$

143 In practice, calculating E_m using eqn 3 requires ontogenetic growth data in order to estimate
 144 $[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}]$. In the absence of such data, an upper bound estimate for E_m , E_m^* , can be
 145 calculated using estimates of growth rate taken early in ontogeny

$$E_m^* \approx B_r \frac{dt}{dm}, \quad (4)$$

146 when the mass of an individual is negligible compared to the asymptotic adult mass, $m \ll M$
 147 (Moses *et al.* 2008).

148 The quantity E_m reflects energy allocated to growth via both direct and indirect paths (Hou
 149 *et al.* 2008). Thus, its magnitude does not correspond to the combustion energy (i.e. chemical-
 150 energy content) of assimilated biomass (Makarieva *et al.* 2004). Rather, it corresponds to
 151 the sum of all direct and indirect energy costs that an individual must expend in producing
 152 biomass. The direct costs of synthesizing biomass may, in fact, be lower than the combustion
 153 energy because, for example, proteins may be constructed from pre-formed amino acids as-
 154 similated from food. The indirect costs include other processes that are not directly related to
 155 biomass production, but that are nevertheless essential for this production to occur (e.g. diges-
 156 tion). While disentangling and quantifying the processes contributing to E_m are challenging,
 157 the overall magnitude of E_m can nevertheless be quantified based on eqns 3 and 4.

158 *Hypothesis H2: E_m is temperature independent.* In the OGM, the temperature dependence
 159 of growth rates is assumed to be governed by the effects of temperature on the resting
 160 metabolic rate normalization, $B_o(T)$ (eqn 1; Gillooly *et al.* 2002). A corollary of this assump-
 161 tion is that E_m is invariant with respect to environmental temperature. This hypothesis can be
 162 readily assessed by investigating the relationship between empirically-estimated values of E_m
 163 (eqns 3 and 4) and the environmental temperature at which organisms grow.

164 *Hypothesis H3: E_m is independent of ecological variables such as trophic level and level*
 165 *of activity.* While the OGM assumes invariance of E_m over ontogeny, it currently makes no
 166 predictions regarding variation in E_m among species. In fact, it is known empirically that E_m
 167 varies across multiple clades of animals (Wieser 1994; Moses *et al.* 2008; Sears *et al.* 2012).
 168 For fish, the possible causes for this variation are still unknown, but may be related to ecologi-
 169 cal variables. For instance, fishes at higher trophic levels may have generally higher E_m values
 170 at least in part because trophic level is positively associated with muscle protein (Killen *et al.*
 171 2016), which may be expensive to generate. For similar reasons, caudal aspect ratio ($= h^2/s$,
 172 where h is the height of the caudal fin and s its surface area), a proxy for activity level (Froese
 173 & Pauly 2017), may also be positively correlated with E_m . Here we explore these ideas using
 174 Hypothesis H3, invariance of E_m , as a null expectation.

175 *The role of E_m in constraining trophic efficiency and food-web structure*

176 Understanding how and why E_m varies is of fundamental importance to predicting constraints
 177 on the efficiency of energy transfer between trophic levels (Economo *et al.* 2005; Andersen
 178 *et al.* 2009). In fact, E_m is a primary determinant of the fraction of assimilated food that is
 179 transferable to the next trophic level, as we will now show. The rate of energy assimilation by
 180 an individual of size m , $A(m)$, is (Hou *et al.* 2008)

$$A(m) = B_{tot} + E_c \frac{dm}{dt} = fB_r + E_c \frac{B_r}{E_m} \left[1 - \left(\frac{m}{M} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right] =$$

$$B_o(T)m^\alpha \left[f + \frac{E_c}{E_m} \left[1 - \left(\frac{m}{M} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right] \right], \quad (5)$$

181 where E_c is the combustion energy of biomass ($\sim 24 \text{ kJ g}^{-1}$ dry mass; Hou *et al.* 2008), and

182 B_{tot} is the total (i.e. field) metabolic rate, which is defined as the sum of the resting metabolic
 183 rate, B_r , and the active rate that sustains locomotion, feeding, and other activities. Following
 184 Hou *et al.* (2008), we assume that $B_{tot} = fB_r$ in the expression above, where f is a dimen-
 185 sionless parameter referred to as ‘activity scope’, which is constrained to be greater than 1 and
 186 less than the ratio of maximum metabolic rate to resting metabolic rate (i.e. “factorial aero-
 187 bic scope” sensu Killen *et al.* 2016). Using eqns 1, 3 and 5, we can calculate the fraction of
 188 energy assimilated by a prey individual, ε , that is transferred to the next trophic level through
 189 consumption of prey biomass by a predator. This fraction is calculated by taking the ratio of
 190 the amount of energy contained in a prey item consumed at size m , E_cm , and the total *lifetime-*
 191 *integrated* amount of energy that the prey item has assimilated from birth to its age at con-
 192 sumption, t^* ,

$$\varepsilon = \frac{E_cm}{\int_{t=0}^{t^*} A(m(t)) dt}, \quad (6)$$

193 where $m(t)$ is mass at age t (eqns S4–S6), and $t^* = -E_m \ln \left[1 - \left(\frac{m}{M} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right] / (B_o(T)M^{1-\alpha}(1 -$
 194 $\alpha))$ is an approximation to the age at which the prey was consumed, assuming that the prey’s
 195 mass at birth m_0 , is negligible relative to its asymptotic size ($m_0/M \approx 0$ in eqn S6). Eqn 6
 196 quantitatively predicts that if a prey individual is consumed by a predator at an earlier life his-
 197 tory stage, $m/M \approx 0$, a larger fraction of the prey’s assimilated energy, ε , will be transferable
 198 to its predator. It is important to note that these efficiencies represent upper-bound estimates
 199 because they only incorporate energy losses attributable to the respiration of the prey, and thus
 200 exclude other factors affecting the energy transfer (e.g. food assimilation efficiency by preda-
 201 tors). Eqn 6 can be readily integrated numerically to calculate how maximum transfer effi-
 202 ciency, ε , changes with E_m , relative ontogenetic stage, m/M , and activity scope, f .

203 We can also use eqn 6 to expand theoretical predictions obtained from a static size-
 204 spectrum model (Brown & Gillooly 2003). This model predicts a specific relationship
 205 between total biomass, W , and individual body mass, m ,

$$W \propto m^{1 + \frac{\ln(\varepsilon)}{\ln(PPMR)} - \alpha}, \quad (7)$$

206 based on the size-scaling of metabolic rate (α) and the assumptions that the predator-prey
 207 body-mass ratio, $PPMR$, and the efficiency of energy transfer between trophic levels, ϵ , are
 208 held constant moving between trophic levels (Brown & Gillooly 2003).

209 **2. Data compilation**

210 We use two independent datasets to test hypotheses $H1-H3$. Dataset I comprises 179 exper-
 211 imentally measured paired estimates of growth rate (g wet mass d^{-1}) and metabolic rate (J
 212 d^{-1}) taken early in ontogeny (25 measurements for embryos and 154 measurements for lar-
 213 vae), meaning that $m/M \approx 0$, and hence that $[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}] \approx 1$. These data encompass 18
 214 species of marine and freshwater fishes with body masses of $9 \mu\text{g} - 0.5 \text{ g}$ and temperatures of
 215 $3 - 28^\circ\text{C}$ (Supplementary Information).

216 Dataset II was obtained from FishBase (Froese & Pauly 2017). It contains 2,849 sets of pa-
 217 rameter estimates, corresponding to 2,849 ontogenetic growth curves, that were obtained by
 218 fitting the von Bertalanffy growth model (BGM) (von Bertalanffy 1957) to age and size data
 219 collected from 503 species of marine and freshwater fish species. As is the tradition in fish-
 220 eries science, these growth curves were characterized using *length* rather than mass. To ob-
 221 tain standardized mass-based estimates of growth rate, we calculate optimum (i.e. maximum)
 222 growth rates, g_{opt} , at mass m_{opt} , by combining these length-based data with species-specific
 223 estimates of the mass-length conversion parameters. These g_{opt} estimates encompass 62 fam-
 224 ilies and a temperature range of $-0.9-30^\circ\text{C}$. In the Supplementary Information, we derive an
 225 analytical approximation (eqns S4-S16) that justifies using BGM-estimated optimum growth
 226 rates to assess hypotheses derived from the OGM.

227 **3. Testing hypotheses $H1-H3$**

228 $H1$. The size and temperature dependence of growth rates from Dataset I were estimated by
 229 fitting eqn 2 to log-transformed data,

$$\ln \left[\frac{dm}{dt} \right] = \ln g_o + \gamma \ln m + \frac{E_g}{k} \left(\frac{1}{T_s} - \frac{1}{T} \right) - \ln I(T). \quad (8)$$

230 We fit eqn 8 using a Bayesian procedure implemented in the R package *brms* version 2.1.0
 231 (Bürkner 2017) in order to derive posterior distributions and associated 95% credible intervals
 232 (CIs) for the fitted parameters (Table 1). A hierarchical modeling approach was adopted for
 233 this analysis with species-level random effects on the intercept (Supplementary Information).
 234 For the analysis of Dataset II, the size and temperature dependencies of optimum growth rates,
 235 g_{opt} , at size m_{opt} were estimated by fitting a simplified version of eqn 2, without the inactiva-
 236 tion term for the temperature dependence to log-transformed data

$$\ln g_{opt} = \ln g_o + \gamma \ln m_{opt} + \frac{E_g}{k} \left(\frac{1}{T_s} - \frac{1}{T} \right), \quad (9)$$

237 which is equivalent to the simple Boltzmann relationship commonly used in the early
 238 Metabolic Theory of Ecology (MTE) literature (Gillooly *et al.* 2002; Brown *et al.* 2004). In
 239 contrast to Dataset I, the growth-rate data from Dataset II yielded little evidence of tempera-
 240 ture optima (Supplementary Information), most likely because these data were obtained from
 241 field-captured individuals, which are not expected to occur above their optimum temperatures
 242 in nature. While the lack of well-defined optima provides empirical justification for fitting
 243 the simpler Boltzmann relationship to estimate an overall temperature dependence, this
 244 approach obscures any changes in temperature dependence over the temperature range. It
 245 also results in negative bias for estimated activation energy if a temperature optimum exists.
 246 A hierarchical modeling approach was adopted for this analysis, with family-level random
 247 effects on the intercept, mass-scaling exponent and temperature-dependence slope ($\Delta\gamma$, ΔE_g ,
 248 $\Delta \ln g_o$; Supplementary Information).

249 *H2* and *H3*. In Dataset I, we used the paired measurements of metabolic and growth rates to
 250 obtain upper-bound estimates for the energy expended in growth, E_m^* (eqn 4), on a wet mass
 251 basis. In Dataset II, estimates of E_m (wet mass basis) were calculated using eqn 3 by combin-
 252 ing a subset of the g_{opt} estimates ($n = 582$) with estimates of *standard* metabolic rate, which
 253 account for the effects of body size and temperature (Barneche *et al.* 2014), and trophic level
 254 (Killen *et al.* 2016) (Supplementary Information). In the fish literature, resting rates are re-
 255 ferred to as ‘standard rates’ at some specified temperature because the metabolic rate of a rest-
 256 ing fish will vary with ambient temperature. Calculations of E_m were restricted to 13 families

with growth rate and standard metabolic rate data. The maintenance-correction term in eqn 3, $[1 - (m_{opt}/M)^{1-\alpha}]$, was assumed to be 0.23 for these calculations, which corresponds to the overall size-scaling exponent for fish resting metabolic rates, $\alpha = 0.77$ (Supplementary Information).

We assessed whether E_m^* (Dataset I) and E_m (Dataset II) exhibit temperature dependence (hypothesis *H2*), and whether E_m (Dataset II only) varies with aspect ratio and trophic level (hypothesis *H3*) by fitting a linear model of the form

$$\ln E_m = \ln \beta_0 + \beta_T T + \beta_L \ln L + \beta_A \ln(A + 1), \quad (10)$$

where β_0 , β_T , β_L , and β_A are respectively the fixed-effect model intercept and three slope parameters, T is temperature in degrees Celsius, L (ranging from 2 to 4.4) is a continuous variable for trophic level, and A is the caudal fin aspect ratio (ranging from 0 to 2.99). Species-level estimates of the latter two ecological measures were downloaded from FishBase to assess hypothesis *H3* for the E_m estimates in Dataset II. When species values were not available, congeneric species values were used. The relationships of these ecological measures to E_m^* were not investigated for Dataset I because the measures are not representative of trophic level or morphology for individuals at early ontogenetic stages. Model parameters were assigned vague priors in a Bayesian modelling framework. We also included normally distributed random effects for $\ln \beta_0$ and β_T , thereby allowing them to vary by species (Dataset I) and family (Dataset II). The model fitting procedure in *brms* is similar to that described for eqns 8 and 9 (Supplementary Information).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis H1

The growth rate models (eqns 8 and 9) for both datasets reveal substantial species- (Dataset I) and family-level (Dataset II) variation in size- and temperature-corrected growth rates, characterized by standard deviations $\sigma_{\Delta \ln g_o}$. Particularly, the estimate from Dataset I implies a ~ 1.6 -fold change in growth rates among species ($\approx e^{2 \times 0.22}$, with $\sigma_{\Delta \ln g_o} = 0.22$), while the estimate

from Dataset II implies an ~ 2.2 -fold change in growth rates among families ($\approx e^{2 \times 0.39}$, with $\sigma_{\Delta \ln g_o} = 0.39$). After accounting for maintenance costs attributable to age in Dataset II (i.e. $[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}] = [1 - (m_{opt}/M)^{(1-0.77)}] \approx 0.23$), the average estimate of $\ln g_o$ is only about 3-fold higher for Dataset I than for Dataset II (Table 1). Therefore, the mass dependencies of growth rates for Datasets I and II can be reasonably approximated by a single allometric function that spans 10 orders of magnitude in body mass (Fig. 1).

Contrary to hypothesis *H1*, the analyses of Datasets I and II yield contrasting estimates for the mass scaling of growth rates, characterized by the scaling exponent γ (Table 1). The average within-species γ is significantly steeper than 0.75 early in ontogeny (Dataset I average: 0.85; 95% CI: 0.80–0.91), but statistically indistinguishable from 0.75 at the size of optimum growth rate (Dataset II average: 0.77; 95% CI: 0.74–0.80). It is possible that the true scaling exponent in Dataset I would approach a value of 1 (i.e. isometric mass scaling) if variation in energy allocation to maintenance with ontogenetic stage, m/M , were accounted for. One would need full ontogenetic growth trajectories for these individuals (as we have for Dataset II) – including asymptotic adult mass, which can vary with temperature and other factors – in order to estimate their maintenance costs.

Overall, our results are consistent with previous observations that metabolic scaling is steeper early in ontogeny for fish (e.g. Bochdansky & Leggett 2001). They also highlight the importance of correction for ontogeny in order to properly evaluate mass scaling of growth rates among species (Moses *et al.* 2008), and reinforce the idea that the scaling of biological rates early in ontogeny may be steeper than the canonical value of 3/4 that is generally assumed by MTE (West *et al.* 1997), perhaps due to changes in the circulatory system during larval-post larval transition. The model of West *et al.* (1997), in fact, predicts positive deviations from 3/4-power scaling if size range encompasses very small organisms that have vascular distribution networks with only a few levels of branching. Evaluating more detailed predictions would require data on aorta and capillary diameters, and the numbers of branching generations from aorta to capillary (West *et al.* 1997, 2001; Brummer *et al.* 2017).

Hypotheses *H2–H3*

The average temperature dependence of growth rates differ between Datasets I and II. While

311 it is statistically indistinguishable from the predicted 0.6–0.7 eV range for Dataset I (average
 312 for E_g : 0.65 eV; 95% CI: 0.48–0.93 eV), consistent with previous estimates of temperature
 313 dependence of developmental times in fishes (Pauly & Pullin 1988; Gillooly *et al.* 2002), it is
 314 significantly shallower than this value for Dataset II (average for E_g : 0.26 eV; 95% CI: 0.19–
 315 0.34 eV). This unexpected low temperature dependence might be due in part to errors in age
 316 estimation in seasonally-growing species (Campana 2001), statistical artifact of errors intro-
 317 duced by estimating masses from length-weight functions, and/or negative bias for the esti-
 318 mated activation energy due to our inability to account for temperature optima. It might also
 319 reflect differences in how laboratory-grown (Dataset I) versus field-grown (Dataset II) fish re-
 320 spond to temperature, perhaps owing to (i) differences in resource availability, or (ii) changes
 321 over ontogeny.

322 Estimates of E_m^* and E_m cover a similar range of values, and vary by ~ 3 orders of magni-
 323 tude (Fig. 2). While these estimates highlight substantial variation in the calculated amount of
 324 energy an organism must expend in producing biomass, we note that they are comparable in
 325 magnitude to values reported for other groups of animals including insects, bivalves, anurans,
 326 birds and mammals (Wieser 1994; Moses *et al.* 2008; Sears *et al.* 2012).

327 Consistent with hypothesis $H2$, the estimated upper-bound E_m^* was independent of tem-
 328 perature in 78% of the 18 species in Dataset I (i.e. 95% credible intervals overlapped 0; β_T
 329 = -0.04, 95% CI: -0.08–0.01; Fig. 2). In contrast, we observed a significant temperature de-
 330 pendence of E_m in 92% of the 13 families for which we could calculate E_m in Dataset II, with
 331 an average 22-fold increase in E_m moving from 0°C to 30°C ($\beta_T = 0.1032$, 95% CI: 0.0701–
 332 0.1411; Fig. 2). Thus, these results suggest that a fish in the tropics requires substantially
 333 more assimilated energy to produce a unit of biomass than a fish in the polar regions. The dis-
 334 crepancy we observe with regard to temperature dependence for E_m between Datasets I and II
 335 warrants further investigation and careful scrutiny. Given this important caveat, our results for
 336 Dataset II are consistent with earlier accounts of decreasing growth efficiency with increasing
 337 temperature in fishes (e.g. Houde 1989; Jobling 1997; McCarthy *et al.* 1998) and microbes
 338 (Apple *et al.* 2006).

339 After accounting for the effects of temperature, contrary to hypothesis $H3$, we found sub-
 340 stantial evidence (i.e. 95% posterior credible intervals did not overlap 0) of systematic in-

creases in E_m with fish trophic level ($\beta_L = 0.73$, 95% CI: 0.34–1.12), and aspect ratio ($\beta_A = 0.41$, 95% CI: 0.10–0.71). Therefore, our results are consistent with the fact that species with higher muscle protein content might exhibit higher metabolic costs to build biomass. However, top predators may have higher assimilation efficiencies (Sanders *et al.* 2016). Thus, our findings may reveal some important physiological trade-offs (i.e. assimilation efficiency versus cost of growth) that might occur across trophic levels, which will have fundamental effects on the trophic structure of food webs (see below).

The role of E_m in constraining trophic efficiency and food-web structure

We integrated the assimilation rate numerically in eqn 6 to calculate the curves for Fig. 3. Results of these calculations demonstrate that the efficiency of energy transfer varies considerably with E_m over the range of values that were empirically observed in Fig. 2. In fact, the effects of E_m are of comparable magnitude to those of ontogenetic stage, highlighting the quantitative importance of this variable for understanding energy transfers between trophic levels. Moreover, eqn 6 also predicts that higher values of activity scope (f) will have substantial negative effects on the efficiency of energy transfer, highlighting the ecological importance that this variable has to food-web trophic structure (Killen *et al.* 2016).

The calculated range of efficiencies depicted in Fig. 3 were combined with parameters from eqn 7 in order to predict how ecosystem-level size structure may change in relation to prey growth energetics, E_m , and ontogenetic stage, m/M (Fig. 4). For instance, our model indicates that the existence of real closed-system top-heavy pyramids may be energetically and ecologically unlikely (e.g. Trebilco *et al.* 2016) – red area in Fig. 4 – because individuals would need to be characterized by low values of E_m , and would have to prey exclusively on very young offspring (i.e. high-efficiency prey resource). Moreover, compared to aquatic food-webs where the youngest prey available are comprised of eggs and larvae (i.e. $m/M \approx 0$), communities of viviparous animals (e.g. mammals with large offspring relative to adult size), might be constrained to have a bottom-heavy trophic pyramid at least in part because the youngest prey items available (e.g. newborn cubs) are relatively large relative to their asymptotic size and thus relatively inefficient at accruing biomass after birth. Future refinement and tests of these predictions will require an assessment of ontogenetic stage of prey items in diets

370 of different species at the community level.

371 Our approach builds on a simple static size spectrum model (Brown & Gillooly 2003), but
372 could inform more sophisticated contemporary dynamic size spectrum models that explicitly
373 connect ontogenetic growth to population and ecosystem dynamics (e.g. Andersen *et al.* 2016;
374 Blanchard *et al.* 2017). For example, these models incorporate ontogenetic growth in a man-
375 ner that is more closely related to the BGM. Recognizing that the efficiency of energy transfer
376 changes with the relative ontogenetic stage of the prey, and that this efficiency might change
377 with temperature, trophic and activity levels through their effects on E_m (but see Barange *et al.*
378 2014 for recent integration of temperature effects) may therefore represent a fundamental step
379 forward.

380 Finally, our findings might also yield important insights in terms of fisheries management.
381 For example, in oligotrophic coastal marine communities such as coral reefs, mass-spawning
382 events are very frequent (e.g. Harrison *et al.* 1984), and high-efficiency recycling of energy
383 and nutrients might be imperative. Thus, preserving large individuals that produce more (and
384 larger) eggs in aquatic communities (Birkeland & Dayton 2005) may be key to the mainte-
385 nance of high-efficiency energy transfers between trophic levels. Understanding the energetics
386 of growth across different trophic levels (and/or functional groups) might therefore help estab-
387 lish baselines of recovery potential in coastal fisheries (MacNeil *et al.* 2015).

388 FUTURE DIRECTIONS

389 Overall, our study demonstrates how growth rate and metabolic rate data can be synthesized
390 within a theoretical framework to obtain a deeper understanding of the energetics of growth
391 (Fig. 1). Particularly, our results reveal fundamental constraints (Fig. 2) on ecosystem dynam-
392 ics that arise from individual-level metabolism (Figs. 3 and 4). Our analysis highlight general
393 trends, but also important differences among datasets, as well as among species, particularly
394 with regards to the temperature dependence of E_m . New methods are needed to quantify and
395 predict E_m – across a broad range of taxa in both terrestrial and aquatic systems – based on the
396 underlying energetics of the biochemical processes involved in the construction of biomass.
397 Uncovering the drivers of variation in this single quantity (e.g. temperature, mode of activity,
398 habitat, phylum) is a fruitful avenue forward: it offers an opportunity to bridge multiple dis-

399 ciplines – from physiology to phylogenetics to ecosystem ecology – across space and time.
400 Such an interdisciplinary approach is needed if we are to predict how rising temperatures are
401 going to affect life-history evolution, ecosystem dynamics, the rehabilitation of economically
402 important fisheries stocks, and the global carbon cycle.

403 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

404 We thank the Associate Editor and two anonymous referees for constructive criticism that
405 helped improve earlier versions of this paper. This project was supported by Macquarie Uni-
406 versity (PhD scholarship to D.R.B.), and the Centre for Geometric Biology at Monash Univer-
407 sity (Post-doctoral fellowship to D.R.B.).

408 **REFERENCES**

- 409 1. Al-Habsi, S.H., Sweeting, C.J., Polunin, N.V.C. & Graham, N.A.J. (2008). $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$
410 elucidation of size-structured food webs in a Western Arabian Sea demersal trawl assemblage.
411 *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 353, 55–63.
- 412 2. Andersen, K., Beyer, J. & Lundberg, P. (2009). Trophic and individual efficiencies of size-
413 structured communities. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*,
414 276, 109–114.
- 415 3. Andersen, K.H., Jacobsen, N.S. & Farnsworth, K.D. (2016). The theoretical foundations
416 for size spectrum models of fish communities. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
417 *Sciences*, 73, 575–588.
- 418 4. Apple, J.K., del Giorgio, P.A. & Kemp, W.M. (2006). Temperature regulation of bacterial
419 production, respiration, and growth efficiency in a temperate salt-marsh estuary. *Aquatic Mi-*
420 *crobial Ecology*, 43, 243–254.
- 421 5. Atkinson, D. (1994). Temperature and organism size—A biological law for ectotherms? *Ad-*
422 *vances in Ecological Research*, 25, 1–58.
- 423 6. Barange, M., Merino, G., Blanchard, J.L., Scholtens, J., Harle, J. & Allison, E.H. *et al.*
424 (2014). Impacts of climate change on marine ecosystem production in societies dependent

425 on fisheries. *Nature Climate Change*, 4, 211–216.

426 7. Barneche, D.R., Kulbicki, M., Floeter, S.R., Friedlander, A.M., Maina, J. & Allen, A.P.
 427 (2014). Scaling metabolism from individuals to reef-fish communities at broad spatial scales.
 428 *Ecology Letters*, 17, 1067–1076.

429 8. Birkeland, C. & Dayton, P.K. (2005). The importance in fishery management of leaving the
 430 big ones. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 20, 356–358.

431 9. Blanchard, Julia L., Heneghan, Ryan F., Everett, Jason D., Trebilco, Rowan & Richardson,
 432 A.J. (2017). From bacteria to whales: Using functional size spectra to model marine ecosys-
 433 tems. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 32, 174–186.

434 10. Bochdansky, A.B. & Leggett, W.C. (2001). Winberg revisited: Convergence of routine
 435 metabolism in larval and juvenile fish. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*,
 436 58, 220–230.

437 11. Brown, J.H. & Gillooly, J.F. (2003). Ecological food webs: High-quality data facilitate
 438 theoretical unification. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 1467–1468.

439 12. Brown, J.H., Gillooly, J.F., Allen, A.P., Savage, V.M. & West, G.B. (2004). Toward a
 440 Metabolic Theory of Ecology. *Ecology*, 85, 1771–1789.

441 13. Brown, J.H., Marquet, P.A. & Taper, M.L. (1993). Evolution of body size: Consequences
 442 of an energetic definition of fitness. *The American Naturalist*, 142, 573–584.

443 14. Brummer, A.B., Savage, V.M. & Enquist, B.J. (2017). A general model for metabolic
 444 scaling in self-similar asymmetric networks. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13, 1–25.

445 15. Bürkner, P. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Jour-
 446 nal of Statistical Software, Articles*, 80, 1–28.

447 16. Campana, S.E. (2001). Accuracy, precision and quality control in age determination, in-
 448 cluding a review of the use and abuse of age validation methods. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 59,
 449 197–242.

450 17. Charnov, E.L. & Gillooly, J.F. (2004). Size and temperature in the evolution of fish life
 451 histories. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 44, 494–497.

452 18. Economo, E.P., Kerkhoff, A.J. & Enquist, B.J. (2005). Allometric growth, life-history

453 invariants and population energetics. *Ecology Letters*, 8, 353–360.

454 19. Enberg, K., Dunlop, E.S. & Jørgensen, C. (2008). Fish growth. In: *Encyclopedia of ecol-*
455 *ogy* (eds. Jørgensen, S.E. & Fath, B.D.). Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 1564–1572.

456 20. Froese, R. & Pauly, D. (2017). FishBase.

457 21. Gillooly, J.F., Charnov, E.L., West, G.B., Savage, V.M. & Brown, J.H. (2002). Effects of
458 size and temperature on developmental time. *Nature*, 417, 70–73.

459 22. Harrison, P.L., Babcock, R.C., Bull, G.D., Oliver, J.K., Wallace, C.C. & Willis, B.L.
460 (1984). Mass spawning in tropical reef corals. *Science*, 223, 1186–1189.

461 23. Hou, C., Zuo, W., Moses, M.E., Woodruff, W.H., Brown, J.H. & West, G.B. (2008). En-
462 ergy uptake and allocation during ontogeny. *Science*, 322, 736–739.

463 24. Houde, E.D. (1989). Comparative growth, mortality, and energetics of marine fish larvae:
464 Temperature and implied latitudinal effects. *Fishery Bulletin*, 87, 471–495.

465 25. Irigoien, X., Klevjer, T.A., Røstad, A., Martinez, U., Boyra, G. & Acuña, J.L. *et al.*
466 (2013). Large mesopelagic fishes biomass and trophic efficiency in the open ocean. *Nature*
467 *Communications*, 5, 1–10.

468 26. Jobling, M. (1997). Temperature and growth: Modulation of growth rate via temperature
469 change. In: *Society for experimental biology seminar series 61: Global warming: Implica-*
470 *tions for freshwater and marine fish* (eds. Wood, C.M. & McDonald, D.G.). Book Section.
471 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 225–254.

472 27. Killen, S.S., Glazier, D.S., Rezende, E.L., Clark, T.D., Atkinson, D. & Willener, A.S.T.
473 *et al.* (2016). Ecological influences and morphological correlates of resting and maximal
474 metabolic rates across teleost fish species. *The American Naturalist*, 187, 592–606.

475 28. Kooijman, S.A.L.M. (2009). *Dynamic energy budget theory for metabolic organisation*.
476 3rd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

477 29. Lindeman, R.L. (1942). The trophic-dynamic aspect of ecology. *Ecology*, 23, 399–417.

478 30. MacNeil, M.A., Graham, N.A.J., Cinner, J.E., Wilson, S.K., Williams, I.D. & Maina, J. *et*
479 *al.* (2015). Recovery potential of the world’s coral reef fishes. *Nature*, 520, 341–344.

480 31. Makarieva, A.M., Gorshkov, V.G. & Li, B.-L. (2004). Ontogenetic growth: Models and

theory. *Ecological Modelling*, 176, 15–26.

32. McCarthy, I., Moksness, E. & Pavlov, D.A. (1998). The effects of temperature on growth rate and growth efficiency of juvenile common wolffish. *Aquaculture International*, 6, 207–218.

33. Moses, M.E., Hou, C., Woodruff, W.H., West, G.B., Nekola, J.C. & Zuo, Wenyun *et al.* (2008). Revisiting a model of ontogenetic growth: Estimating model parameters from theory and data. *The American Naturalist*, 171, 632–645.

34. Pauly, D. & Christensen, V. (1995). Primary production required to sustain global fisheries. *Nature*, 374, 255–257.

35. Pauly, D. & Pullin, R.S.V. (1988). Hatching time in spherical, pelagic, marine fish eggs in response to temperature and egg size. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 22, 261–271.

36. Sanders, D., Moser, A., Newton, J. & van Veen, F.J.F. (2016). Trophic assimilation efficiency markedly increases at higher trophic levels in four-level hostparasitoid food chain. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 283.

37. Savage, V.M., Gillooly, J.F., Brown, J.H., West, Geoffrey B. & Charnov, E.L. (2004). Effects of body size and temperature on population growth. *The American Naturalist*, 163, 429–441.

38. Schoolfield, R.M., Sharpe, P.J.H. & Magnuson, C.E. (1981). Non-linear regression of biological temperature-dependent rate models based on absolute reaction-rate theory. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 88, 719–731.

39. Sears, K.E., Kerkhoff, A.J., Messerman, A. & Itagaki, H. (2012). Ontogenetic scaling of metabolism, growth, and assimilation: Testing metabolic scaling theory with *Manduca sexta* larvae. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, 85, 159–173.

40. Sibly, R.M., Baker, J., Grady, J.M., Luna, S.M., Kodric-Brown, A. & Venditti, C. *et al.* (2015). Fundamental insights into ontogenetic growth from theory and fish. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 13934–13939.

41. Szuwalski, C.S., Burgess, M.G., Costello, C. & Gaines, S.D. (2017). High fishery catches through trophic cascades in china. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114,

509 717–721.

510 42. Trebilco, R., Dulvy, N.K., Anderson, S.C. & Salomon, A.K. (2016). The paradox of in-
511 verted biomass pyramids in kelp forest fish communities. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*
512 *London B: Biological Sciences*, 283.

513 43. van Rijn, I., Buba, Y., DeLong, J., Kiflawi, M. & Belmaker, J. (2017). Large but uneven
514 reduction in fish size across species in relation to changing sea temperatures. *Global Change*
515 *Biology*, 23, 3667–3674.

516 44. von Bertalanffy, L. (1938). A quantitative theory of organic growth (Inquiries on growth
517 laws. ii). *Human Biology*, 10, 181–213.

518 45. von Bertalanffy, L. (1957). Quantitative laws in metabolism and growth. *The Quarterly*
519 *Review of Biology*, 32, 217–231.

520 46. West, G.B., Brown, J.H. & Enquist, B.J. (1997). A general model for the origin of allo-
521 metric scaling laws in biology. *Science*, 276, 122–126.

522 47. West, G.B., Brown, J.H. & Enquist, B.J. (2001). A general model for ontogenetic growth.
523 *Nature*, 413, 628–631.

524 48. Wieser, W. (1994). Cost of growth in cells and organisms: General rules and comparative
525 aspects. *Biological Reviews*, 69, 1–33.

526 **TABLES**

527 **Table 1.** Point estimates and 95% credible intervals (as determined using Bayesian meth-
528 ods) for fitted parameters in the growth rate models. Fixed-effect parameters include: γ , the
529 average for the mass-dependence of growth rate; E_g , the average for the temperature depen-
530 dence of growth rate; $\ln g_o$, the average for the mass-corrected growth rate at temperature T_s
531 = 15°C; T_{opt} (Dataset I only), the temperature optimum of fish growth rates and E_i (Dataset I
532 only), the inactivation parameter describing the rate of decline in growth rate at temperatures
533 $> T_{opt}$. Random-effects include the standard deviations for species- (Dataset I) and family-
534 level (Dataset II) variation in size- and temperature-corrected rates at T_s ($\Delta \ln g_o$) as well as
535 standard deviation for family-level size dependence ($\Delta \gamma$) and temperature dependence ΔE_g
536 (Dataset II only).

537

Parameter	I			II		
	Mean	2.5%	97.5%	Mean	2.5%	97.5%
Fixed Effects						
Mass, γ	0.85	0.80	0.91	0.77	0.74	0.80
Activation energy, E_g (eV)	0.65	0.48	0.93	0.26	0.19	0.34
Inactivation parameter, E_i (eV)	2.67	1.18	4.74			
Optimum temperature, T_{opt} (K)	302.47	296.91	309.69			
Normalization, $\ln g_o$ (g g ^{-γ} d ⁻¹)	-3.04	-3.38	-2.57	-5.52	-5.67	-5.34
Random effects						
Std. Deviation of $\Delta \ln g_o$	0.22	0.04	0.47	0.39	0.20	0.61
Std. Deviation of $\Delta \gamma$				0.07	0.04	0.11
Std. Deviation of ΔE_g				0.24	0.17	0.32
Correlation of $\Delta \ln g_o$ and $\Delta \gamma$				-0.70	-0.90	-0.28
Correlation of $\Delta \ln g_o$ and E_g				0.04	-0.43	0.53
Correlation of $\Delta \gamma$ and ΔE_g				0.08	-0.34	0.49

538 FIGURE LEGENDS

539 **Figure 1.** Scaling of growth rates of fish with respect to (left) body mass and (right) and tem-
 540 perature in Datasets I (white squares) and II (grey circles). Parameter estimates (listed in Table
 541 1) were obtained using Bayesian methods. The effect of temperature on growth rate was con-
 542 trolled for by standardizing the temperature measures, T (in K), to $T_s = 288.15$ K ($= 15^\circ\text{C}$)
 543 based on temperature scaling relationships, where k is the Boltzmann constant (8.62×10^{-5}
 544 eV K $^{-1}$). The effect of body mass was controlled for by standardizing measures to 1 gram
 545 based on the mass scaling relationships. The mass-corrected rates at temperature T_s , $\ln g_o$,
 546 for Dataset I ($-3.04 \text{ g}^{1-\gamma} \text{ d}^{-1}$) and Dataset II ($-5.52 \text{ g}^{1-\gamma} \text{ d}^{-1}$), correspond to averages across
 547 species and families, respectively. Dataset I was fitted to a model that allowed $\ln g_o$ to vary
 548 among species, whereas Dataset II was fitted to a model that allowed $\ln g_o$, γ , and E_r to vary
 549 among families. Growth rates from Dataset II are optimum growth rates (g_{opt}) and mass is
 550 mass at optimum growth rates (m_{opt}). Thus, the ontogenetic stage was controlled for (eqn 1)
 551 by expressing growth rates as $(dm/dt)[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}]$, assuming $[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}] = 0.23$ for
 552 Dataset II. For Dataset I, it was assumed that $[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}] = 1$ because growth rates were
 553 measured at an early ontogenetic stage.

554 **Figure 2.** Distributions of values for E_m (in J g $^{-1}$ wet mass), the amount of energy necessary
 555 to produce a unit of biomass at both embryo/larval growth rate (white squares, Dataset I), and
 556 maximum growth rate (grey circles, Dataset II). Values from Dataset I are upper-bound es-
 557 timates of E_m^* obtained from 179 direct measurements of growth rates and metabolic rates
 558 (assuming $[1 - (m/M)^{1-\alpha}] = 1$, eqn 4). Values from Dataset II are E_m estimates (eqn 3) cal-
 559 culated for 582 growth-rate measurements, which encompass 13 families that overlap with the
 560 standard metabolic-rate data from FishBase (Barneche *et al.* 2014). Equations in the top-left
 561 represent the fixed-effect estimates of the temperature dependence of E_m^* and E_m for Datasets I
 562 and II, respectively.

563 **Figure 3.** Upper-bound estimates for the efficiency of energy transfer given different values
 564 for ontogenetic stages, m/M , and E_m (J g $^{-1}$) (eqns 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6). Efficiencies only incorpo-
 565 rate energy losses due to respiration, and thus exclude losses attributable to other processes.
 566 Polygons were calculated for different values of E_m (wet mass basis) which encompass the

range of values estimated in Fig. 2, assuming that $m_o = 0$ g, $\alpha = 0.77$, $B_o = 18.67 \text{ J g}^{-0.77} \text{ d}^{-1}$ for fish at 15°C (Table S1), and $E_c = (24 \text{ kJ g}^{-1} \text{ dry mass}) (0.15 \text{ g dry mass g}^{-1} \text{ wet mass}) = 3,600 \text{ J g}^{-1} \text{ wet mass}$ (Hou *et al.* 2008). Polygon upper and lower bounds represent the efficiencies of individuals either at permanent resting ($f = 1$) or active ($f = 4$) state. An average $f = 4$ is consistent with evidence reported for fishes (Killen *et al.* 2016). The values for m (size at the time of consumption) and M (asymptotic adult size of the prey individual) are arbitrary because ϵ depends only on their ratio.

Figure 4. Relationship between ontogenetic stage of prey at time of predation and energy necessary to produce a unit of biomass E_m , and the resulting effects on the size structuring of biological communities and the energy transfer efficiency between trophic levels (ϵ , eqns 5, 6 and 7). Different colors indicate different resulting community biomass (W) – individual body mass (m) scaling relationships, with blue areas depicting bottom-heavy pyramids and red areas depicting top-heavy pyramids. The black solid line represents an area where $W \propto m^0$, i.e. a biomass stack, which corresponds to an average energy transfer efficiency of 0.14. The values in the figure were calculated assuming $PPMR = 2327:1$ (following Al-Habsi *et al.* 2008), $\alpha = 0.77$, and $f = 2.4$ in eqn 5.